

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 18-38 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 26, 28 and 33-34 are amended, claims 6 and 16-17 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 35-38 are added. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 5 and 29 contain allowable subject matter. However, as will be discussed below, all claims are believed to contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 7, 8 and 26. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments obviate the grounds for objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 14-28 and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent 6,965,413 to Wada. The Office Action also rejects claims 7, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wada in view of U.S. Patent 7,076,271 to Ban et al. (hereafter Ban). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a main body, a folder and a camera module. Independent claim 1 also recites the folder foldably connected to the main body and having a display formed thereon, the folder being foldably connected to allow an open state and a closed state, and wherein, in the closed state, the folder covers at least one of the plurality of buttons. Still further, independent claim 1 also recites that a protrusion is formed at an upper portion of a rear surface of the main body, and the camera module is provided in the

Reply to Office Action dated October 16, 2007

protrusion, the protrusion having a surface. Independent claim 1 also recites that the camera module is mounted such that a viewing direction of the display and an imaging direction of the camera module are substantially parallel when the folder is maintained in the opened state, the viewing direction being substantially orthogonal to a viewing surface of the display, and the imaging direction of the camera module being approximately 90 degrees from the surface of the protrusion.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1, which includes features from previous dependent claim 6. More specifically, Wada does not teach or suggest the claimed viewing direction and imaging direction being substantially parallel when the folder is in the opened state, as recited in independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action (on page 5) appears to provide various different imaging directions and viewing directions of Wada based on a user's position. Independent claim 1 specifically discusses the imaging direction and viewing direction so as to obviate the Office Action's interpretation. Wada does not teach or suggest that the viewing direction is substantially orthogonal to the viewing surface of the display and the imaging direction of the camera module being approximately 90 degrees from the surface of a protrusion in combination with the substantially parallel feature. Wada does not teach or suggest these features as Wada does not specifically relate to this orientation. Ban does not teach or suggest these missing features.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Reply to Office Action dated October 16, 2007

Independent claim 8 recites a first terminal portion, a second terminal portion, a display and a camera. Independent claim 8 also recites a camera mounted within the first terminal portion such that a display viewing direction is substantially parallel to a camera imaging direction when the second terminal portion is in the opened configuration relative to the first terminal position, wherein the display viewing direction comprises a direction that is substantially orthogonal to a viewing surface of the display, and wherein the camera imaging direction comprises a direction that is substantially parallel to a bisector of a field of view of the camera.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not or suggest at least these features of independent claim 8, which includes features of previous dependent claims 16-17. The applied references do not teach or suggest the claimed display viewing direction, camera imaging direction and “substantially parallel” features of independent claim 8. Thus, independent claim 8 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 26 recites a first body, a second body, a camera module and a protrusion. Independent claim 26 also recites that when the second body is in the opened position relative to the first body, a viewing direction of the display is substantially parallel with an imaging direction of the camera module, wherein the viewing direction is substantially orthogonal to a viewing surface of the display, and the imaging direction of the camera module is approximately 90 degrees from the surface of the protrusion.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not or suggest at least these features of independent claim 26. The applied references do not teach or suggest the claimed viewing direction, imaging direction and “substantially

Reply to Office Action dated October 16, 2007

parallel" features of independent claim 26. Thus, independent claim 26 defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 8 and 26 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 36 recites that in the opened state, the folder and the main body are maintained at a specific angle with respect to each other. See also dependent claims 35 and 37. Wada does not teach or suggest these features. More specifically, Wada does not teach or suggest that in an opened state, the folder and the main body are maintained at a specific angle with respect to each other, in combination with the camera module being mounted such that a viewing direction and an imaging direction are substantially parallel when the folder is maintained in the opened state. Thus, dependent claim 36 defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason. Dependent claims 35 and 37 define patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-5, 7-15 and 18-38 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would

Serial No. **10/624,524**

Docket No. **P-0483**

Reply to Office Action dated October 16, 2007

place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: January 7, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610